

REMARKS

The present application was filed on November 21, 2003 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claim 10 is proposed to be amended herein.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-15, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crue et al. (United States Patent Number 6,693,768). The Examiner indicated that claims 3-5 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Independent Claims 1, 10 and 14

10 Independent claims 1, 10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crue et al.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Crue teaches at least one shutter to selectively allow said magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain of said magnetic storage medium (col. 3, lines 36-42, wherein it teaches using a component as a "shutter" by changing the magnetic fields by changing the direction of the magnetic field to change the binary data to be recorded, which is the Applicant's description of a "shutter").

Applicants note, however, that Crue teaches that

20 ***changing the direction of current*** changes the direction of flux created by the recording head, and therefore changes the magnetic fields within the magnetic storage medium. A binary "0" is recorded by maintaining a constant direction of magnetic flux through the main pole, and a binary "1" is recorded by ***changing*** the direction of magnetic flux through the main pole.
(Col. 3, lines 36-42; emphasis added.)

25 The present invention, on the other hand, continuously energizes a write coil for at least a plurality of bit intervals. The path of the magnetic field is controlled by one or more shutters to *selectively* alter the magnetic domain of a magnetic storage material. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants could find no disclosure or suggestion by Crue that a *shutter* is used to change the magnetic field(s). Independent claims 1 and 14 require at least one ***shutter*** to
30 *selectively allow said magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain* of said magnetic storage

medium, and independent claim 10, as amended, requires *selectively allowing said magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain* of said magnetic storage medium *by utilizing a shutter*. Crue does not disclose or suggest utilizing a *shutter to selectively allow a magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain*.

Thus, Crue et al. do not disclose or suggest at least one shutter to selectively allow said magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain of said magnetic storage medium, as required by independent claims 1 and 14, and do not disclose or suggest selectively allowing said magnetic field to alter a magnetic domain of said magnetic storage medium by utilizing a shutter, as required by independent claim 10, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-13 and 15-20

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crue et al.

Claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-20 are dependent on claims 1, 10, and 14, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Crue because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 10, and 14 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: November 29, 2005